

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended.

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ala-Laurila et al: "Wireless LAN Access Network Architecture for Mobile Operators", IEEE Communication Magazine, 'IEEE Service Center, Piscataway N.J., US vol. 39, no. 11, November 2001 (2001-11), pages 82-89, hereinafter "Ala-Laurila". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify that the "billing controller 181 of the WLAN controller 180 receives the first authentication response message 480 and in response the billing controller 181 sends a second authentication response message 490 to the base station 220 via the communication system interface 185", support for which can be found on page 10 first full paragraph. None of the cited art refers to a separate billing controller.

Claims 1 and 10 have also been amended to clarify that a WLAN controller sends a request for SIM access to a device while also initiating a call with a cellular system. Support for this can be found in the text on page 9 second full paragraph to page 10 last full paragraph, describing Fig. 2. In addition, claim 1 has been further amended to clarify that the charging call is "made" instead of being "set up", as is supported in the text on page 15, last paragraph, in order to eliminate the confusion that the term "setting up" makes with the "initiating" and "sending/receiving/forwarding" steps. In this way, applicant respectfully submits that the amended language of claim 1 addresses the Examiners concerns about the claim language being distinguishing over the cited art.

Advantageously, applicant's invention solves the problem of requesting and obtaining access through two communication systems without violating an authentication process timeout of either system.

Ala-Laurila describes interfacing a WLAN network with another communication system and using the authentication capabilities of the second system. In Ala-Laurila, referring to Fig. 4 and columns 1 and 2 of the page 86 of the text, the authentication and access provided between the two systems is accomplished in a serial manner and is missing the parallel processing aspects of amended claims 1 and 10. In particular, Ala-Laurila is missing the parallel elements of sending and initiating, as recited in amended claims 1 and 10. Moreover, Ala-Laurila does not

reflect on the problem of authentication timing, and therefore could not have envisioned applicant's solution and inventive steps for providing proper authentication before a timeout.

Therefore, Ala-Laurila fails to suggest or disclose the parallel elements of sending and initiating, as recited in amended claims 1 and 10. In addition, Ala-Laurila fails to reflect on the problem of authentication timing, and therefore could not have envisioned applicant's solution and inventive steps for providing proper authentication before a timeout, as further specified in amended claim 2.

As a result, applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1 and 10 are novel and inventive over the cited art.

Claim 11 has a similar recitation in claim 1, so claim 11 has been recast to clarify that the second communication system subscription information is subscription authentication information.

Claims 2-9 and 11 are dependent upon amended claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, and are therefore deemed novel and inventive over the cited art as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of McIntosh et al. (US Publ. 2003/0139180). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended into what applicant considers is a condition for allowance as detailed above.

Claims 3 and 5 are dependent on amended claim 1, hereby incorporated by reference, and are therefore deemed allowable as well for the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection or through an Examiner's amendment.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,  
**Jones et al.**

**Customer Number 22917**

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Dept. - 3<sup>rd</sup> floor  
1303 E. Algonquin Rd.  
Schaumburg, IL 60196

By: /Brian Mancini/  
Brian M. Mancini  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 39,288  
Phone: (847) 576-3992  
FAX: (847) 576-3750